

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DARRICK ANTHONY COLEMAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

D079958

(Super. Ct. No. SCD280153)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Laura W. Halgren, Judge. Affirmed.

Jason Szydlik, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Darrick Anthony Coleman pleaded guilty to possession of a firearm by a felon (Pen. Code,¹ § 29800, subd. (a)(1)) and admitted a prior strike (§ 667, subds. (b)-(i)). The remaining charge and allegations were dismissed.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

The court denied Coleman's motion to dismiss the strike prior. (*People v. Superior Court (Romero)* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 497.) The court sentenced Coleman to the mid-term of two years, doubled because of the prior strike.

Coleman filed a timely notice of appeal challenging matters occurring after the plea.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), indicating counsel has not been able to identify any arguable issues for reversal on appeal. Counsel asks the court to review the record for error as mandated by *Wende*. We offered Coleman the opportunity to file his own brief on appeal but, he has not responded.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

This appeal is from a guilty plea. Coleman admitted he possessed a firearm as a convicted felon.

DISCUSSION

As we have noted, appellate counsel has filed a *Wende* brief and asks the court to review the record. To assist the court in its review, and in compliance with *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), counsel has identified the following possible issues which were considered in evaluating the potential merits of this appeal:

1. Did the court err in denying Coleman's motion to strike the prior conviction (*Romero* motion)?
2. Did the court err in accepting Coleman's guilty plea when he was not physically present in court?

We have reviewed the entire record as required by *Wende* and *Anders*. We have not discovered any arguable issues for reversal on appeal. Competent counsel has represented Coleman on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HUFFMAN, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

O'ROURKE, J.

BUCHANAN, J.